

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 16-26, as amended, will be pending.

Indefiniteness Rejections

In the Office Action dated July 13, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 20 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

In particular, the Examiner contends that claim 21 is rendered indefinite by the phrase "*individual filaments of the fibers*". Applicants confirm the Examiner's assumption that the term "fiber" includes "a bundle of fibers."

The Examiner also contends that claim 24 is rendered indefinite by the phrase "*polyethylene/polyamide*". As would be appreciated by those of ordinary skill in the art, the term "*polypropylene/ polyamide*" includes co-extrusion films.

Anticipation and Obviousness Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 16-18, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuchiyama (Progress in Science and Engineering of Composites, Proceedings of the ICCM-IV, Tokyo, 1982)(hereinafter "Tsuchiyama"). The Examiner also rejected claims 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of U.S. Patent 6,040,391 (hereinafter "Rinz"). The Examiner also rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama, which is moot in view of the cancellation thereof. Moreover, the Examiner rejected claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchiyama in view of U.S. Patent 6,119,750 (hereinafter "Greve").

As indicated above, claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of previously presented claim 21. Moreover, new claim 25, that corresponds to pending claims 16 and 19, has been added. Moreover, new claim 26, that corresponds to pending claims 16 and 23, has been added. No new matter has been added to the pending claims by way of these amendments.

Tsuchiyama fails to teach or suggest the present invention directed to a method of making from laminate a carbon-fiber-filled sheet molding compound comprising maintaining the compacted laminate for a set time period to mature the laminate for further molding. Moreover, none of the secondarily-cited references cure these deficiencies of Tsuchiyama. As such, pending claim 16 and dependent claims thereon (*i.e.*, claims 17-20 and 22-24) are novel and nonobvious over the cited prior art.

Similarly, neither Tsuchiyama nor Rinz teaches or suggests a method of making from laminate a carbon-fiber-filled sheet molding compound comprising at most about 75% by weight of filler, or rolling the carbon-filled laminate between hold-down pins. Moreover, the cited references fail to provide to one of ordinary skill in the art the requisite motivation to combine these references in the manner asserted by the Examiner.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: 

John E. Mauk
Registration No. 54,579
Direct No. (202) 263-3255

Paul L. Sharer
Registration No. 36,004
Direct No. (202) 263-3340

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: December 13, 2005